

Applicant: Jimmy Lee Long

: Group Art Unit: 3721

Serial No.: 10/612,481

: Examiner: Kim, E.L.

Filed: July 1, 2003

: Date: September 13, 2005

Title: PNEUMATIC ROLLER FOR PASSING FILM
WITH ATTACHMENTS THROUGH ROLLERS
OF MACHINE



Hon. Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Sir:

Transmitted herewith for filing in the above-identified application
is a Response to Final Rejection.

FEE FOR ADDITIONAL CLAIMS

☒ A fee for additional claims is not required.

☐ A fee for additional claims is required. The additional fee
has been calculated as shown below:

	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR		NUMBER OF EXTRA CLAIMS		RATE		ADDITIONAL FEE
TOTAL CLAIMS:	26	-	32	=	0	x	\$50 =		0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS:	3	-	6	=	0	x	\$200 =		0
TOTAL FEE DUE									\$ 0


☐ Our check for payment of the additional claims fee is enclosed.

☒ The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of any
extension or other fee under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 which may be required
by this paper or credit any overpayment of same to Deposit Account No.
50-3195.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant:

Dennis M. Flaherty
Reg. No. 31,159
Ostrager Chong Flaherty &
Broitman P.C.
250 Park Avenue, Suite 825
New York, NY 10177
(212) 681-0600
(212) 681-0300 (fax)



AF
ZMW

Atty. Docket: ITW-14146

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re Application of:

Jimmy Lee Long : Group Art Unit: 3721
Serial No.: 10/612,481 : Examiner: Kim, E.L.
Filed: July 1, 2003
Title: PNEUMATIC ROLLER FOR PASSING FILM
WITH ATTACHMENTS THROUGH ROLLERS
OF MACHINE

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO FINAL REJECTION

Sir:

In response to the Final Rejection dated July 14, 2005 in the above-referenced patent application, the Applicant requests withdrawal of the finality of the rejection and reconsideration of the pending claims for the reasons set forth hereinafter.

**FINALITY OF REJECTION
SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

In the previous (non-final) office action, claims 1-11, 13-21 and 27-32 were rejected as being unpatentable over Satoh in view of Rock. Satoh was cited for teaching the assembly shown in Figure 3. In discussing the relevance of Satoh, the Examiner explicitly cited reference numerals that